

Application No.: 10/713,028Docket No.: 2336-221REMARKS

The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter of claims 1-8 and 14 is noted with appreciation.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-15 have been amended to improve claim language. Claims 16-20 have been added to provide Applicants with the scope of protection to which they are believed entitled. The Abstract has been revised in conformance with commonly accepted US patent practice. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

Claims 1-8 and 14 stand allowed as indicated in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

The rejections of claims 9-13 and 15 as being either anticipated by *Bureau* (U.S. Patent No. 6,492,194) or obvious over *Bureau* in view of *Baba* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 6,815,869) are traversed, because the applied references singly or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest all limitations of the rejected claims, especially claim 9. Independent claim 9 has been amended to improve claim language. The amendments were not necessitated by the Examiner's rejections. The invention of claim 9 is distinguishable from the applied references, especially *Bureau*, for the following reasons.

First, the anti-bur holes of the claimed invention are disposed at corners of the chip mounting areas, whereas the holes 50 of the *Bureau*'s are formed adjacent to lateral portions of the chip mounting areas. *See*, e.g., Fig. 5 of the instant application and Fig. 32 of *Bureau*.

Second, the anti-bur holes of the claimed invention are intersected by cutting lines, and when the package sheet is cut into pieces, the holes are cut, thereby leaving vertical grooves at corners of the resultant SAW packages. *See*, e.g., Fig. 7 of the instant application. However, *Bureau* does not disclose or suggest that the holes 50 are cut. On the contrary, the holes 50 are

Application No.: 10/713,028Docket No.: 2336-221

removed completely during the cutting process, such that SAW packages obtained by *Bureau* do not have any vertical grooves at their corners.

Third, holes 50 of *Bureau* are designed for the purpose of aspiration. See, e.g., Abstract of *Bureau*. In column 4, lines 17-20; and column 5, lines 1-5 of *Bureau*, holes 50 are described as being used to suck air out so that the deformable film 40 can be stably placed against the socket. Apparently, this function does not suggest the anti-burring function of the claimed anti-bur holes.

The deficiencies of *Bureau* are not deemed curable by *Baba*.

Therefore, independent claim 9 is patentable over the applied references. Withdrawal of the art rejections relying on *Bureau* and *Baba* is believed appropriate and therefore courteously solicited.

Claims 10-13, 15 and new claims 16-18 depend from claim 9, and are considered patentable at least for the reason advanced with respect to claim 9. The dependent claims are also believed patentable on their own merits since these claims recite other features of the invention neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by the applied art.

For example, as to claim 16, the applied references, especially *Bureau*, clearly fail to teach or suggest the claimed SAW package wherein the ground pattern has at least a **concave cut-out defined by a peripheral edge of one of the anti-bur holes**. This claim finds solid support in the original application, e.g., at FIG. 7 near reference numeral 52, and at page 16, line 22 of the specification. *Bureau* does not teach or suggest the claimed feature. See, e.g., FIG. 3a of *Bureau*.

Claims 17-18 include limitations similar to claim 16 and are patentable for at least the reason advanced with respect to claim 16.

New claim 19 depends from allowed claim 1 and should be allowed as well.

**Application No.: 10/713,028****Docket No.: 2336-221**

New claim 20 include limitations similar to claim 1, especially the method steps indicated in paragraph 5 of the Office Action to render claim 1 patentable. Therefore, independent claim 20 should be allowed for the same reason as claim 1.

Each of the Examiner's rejections has been traversed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP**

  
Benjamin J. Hauptman  
Registration No. 29,310

USPTO Customer No. 22429  
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 684-1111 BJH/KL/klb  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
Date: September 15, 2005

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION  
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING FACSIMILE TRANSMITTED  
TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW

  
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON SIGNING CERTIFICATION

SIGNATURE

September 15, 2005  
DATE

571-273-8300  
FACSIMILE NUMBER